

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

GREGORY R. SCHMITT
Petitioner,

v.

Case No. 11-C-0065

**DEIRDRE MORGAN, Warden,
Oakhill Correctional Institution
Respondent.**

ORDER

On January 21, 2011, Gregory R. Schmitt filed this petition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, asserting that his state court conviction and sentence were imposed in violation of the Constitution. Petitioner was convicted in Milwaukee County Circuit Court of operating while under the influence. He was sentenced to five years and six months in prison and is currently incarcerated at Oakhill Correctional Institution.

Pursuant to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases, I must give the case prompt initial consideration.

If it plainly appears from the petition and any attached exhibits that the petitioner is not entitled to relief in the district court, the judge must dismiss the petition and direct the clerk to notify the petitioner. If the petition is not dismissed, the judge must order the respondent to file an answer, motion, or other response within a fixed time, or to take other action the judge may order.

Rule 4, Rules Governing § 2254 Cases. During my initial review of habeas petitions, I look to see whether the petitioner has set forth cognizable constitutional or federal law claims.

In the present case, petitioner contends that his trial counsel was ineffective for failing to argue that the criminal complaint was defective for various reasons. Ineffective

assistance of counsel is clearly a constitutional ground for habeas relief under Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668 (1984), and therefore I conclude that petitioner has stated at least one colorable constitutional claim.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that within 30 days of the date of this order respondent **ANSWER** the petition, complying with Rule 5 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases, and showing cause, if any, why the writ should not issue.

FURTHER, IT IS ORDERED that unless respondent files a dispositive motion with its answer the parties shall abide by the following schedule regarding the filing of briefs on the merits of petitioner's claims: (1) petitioner shall have 45 days following the filing of respondent's answer within which to file his brief in support of his petition; (2) respondent shall have 45 days following the filing of petitioner's initial brief within which to file a brief in opposition; and (3) petitioner shall have 30 days following the filing of respondent's opposition brief within which to file a reply brief, if any.

In the event that respondent files a dispositive motion and supporting brief with its answer, this briefing schedule will be suspended and the briefing schedule will be as follows: (1) petitioner shall have 45 days following the filing of respondent's dispositive motion and supporting initial brief within which to file a brief in opposition; and (2) respondent shall have 30 days following the filing of petitioner's opposition brief within which to file a reply brief, if any.

Pursuant to Civil L.R. 7(f), the following page limitations apply: briefs in support of or in opposition to the habeas petition or a dispositive motion filed by respondent must not

exceed thirty pages and reply briefs must not exceed fifteen pages, not counting any statements of facts, exhibits, and affidavits.

Petitioner is advised that he must send copies of all future filings with the court to counsel for respondent, no matter whether in letter, brief, memorandum, or other form. Until respondent files his or her answer, these copies should be sent to the Attorney General for the State of Wisconsin, c/o Gregory Weber, Assistant Attorney General, P.O. Box 7857, Madison, WI 53707.

Pursuant to the Memorandum of Understanding between the Clerk of Court and the Wisconsin Department of Justice, electronic notice of this action will be transmitted to the Attorney General for the State of Wisconsin.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 27th day of January, 2011.

/s _____
LYNN ADELMAN
District Judge